

Application No. 10/811,561 Page 4

REMARKS

Claims 4, 5, and 17 - 26 are presently pending. (There was an error in the Office Action where it refers to Claims 3 - 5 and 17 - 26 as pending.)

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4, 5, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Neff (DE 198 31 940). The Examiner also rejected Claims 4, 5 and 17 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata et al. (JP 6-264985) (hereinafter "Ogata") or Mizuno et al. (JP 8-129938) (hereinafter "Mizuno").

The Examiner has allowed Claims 21 - 26.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his allowance of Claims 21 - 26. For the reasons set forth more fully below, the remaining Claims are deemed to properly present limitations patentable over the cited references. Reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested for Claims 4, 5 and 17 - 20.

The Examiner has relied upon Neff to support an anticipation of Claims 4, 5, 17 and 20. Claim 17 includes the limitation that the cylindrically shaped leadscrew shell has **a ratio of annular thickness to cylindrical diameter within a range of about 0.0004 to about 0.01**. Neff purports to disclose the ratio of the thickness of a Teflon coating on screw threads to the thread diameter, and not leadscrew thickness to leadscrew diameter. Furthermore, that the ratio is concerned with a leadscrew follower nut and not with a leadscrew shaft. Neff's ratio has no relevance to the ratio of a leadscrew shell thickness to the shell diameter. In view of the above, Neff does not include all of the limitations found in the rejected claims as it must to be a proper §102 rejection.


The Examiner has relied on Mizuno and Ogata to question the patentability of Claims 4, 5, 17 - 20. Both Mizuno and Ogata purport to disclose Teflon and non-corrosive coatings on screws and nuts. The coatings are to provide lubrication and prevent rust on the screw, and the nut and ball bearings positioned between the screw and the nut. Like the Neff reference, Mizuno and Ogata are not related to a ratio of leadscrew

Application No. 10/811,561 Page 5

shell thickness to shell diameter. Therefore, no teaching or even suggestion of the limitations of the rejected claims are found in the cited references.

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the presented, but rejected, claims should be allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Gabor Devenyi

By 
William V. Benman, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,014

Benman Brown & Williams
2049 Century Park East
Suite 2740
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 553-2400
(310) 553-2675 facsimile